UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,941	04/02/2004	Joseph K. Haley	42989-199768	. 8948
26694 VENABLE LL	7590 08/07/2007 P		EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 34385			DOAN, ROBYN KIEU	
WASHINGTO	WASHINGTON, DC 20043-9998		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			. 3732	
	•			
		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/07/2007	PAPER .

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/815,941	HALEY, JOSEPH Ķ.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Robyn Doan	3732			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event; however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 M	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>22 May 2007</u> .				
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ This)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-17 is/are pending in the ap 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-17 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the Education of the Education of the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	ite			

Application/Control Number: 10/815,941

Art Unit: 3732

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's Amendment filed 5/22/2007 has been entered and carefully considered. Claims 1, 5, 8, 12 and 14 have been amended. Claim 6 has been canceled. Limitations of amended claims have not been found to be patentable over prior art of record, therefore, claims 1-5, 7-17 are rejected under the same ground rejections as set forth in the office action mailed 2/22/2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tiram in view of Ringdahl (IDS cited reference).

With regard to claims 8, 11 and 12, Tiram discloses an apparatus for trimming hair (fig. 10) comprising a hair trimming device (24), a mirror (32) and a structure (30) connecting the hair trimming device and the mirror, Tiram fails to show the mirror coupled to an attachment member and having a structure to hold the mirror resiliently, wherein in a first position, the mirror extends laterally relative to a first side of the hair trimming device and a second position the mirror extends laterally relative to second side of the trimming device. Ringdahl discloses an apparatus for shaving hair (fig. 2)

comprising a hair trimming device (10), a magnifying lens (34) coupled to the hair trimming device by attachment structure (28), the attachment inherently holds the mirror resiliently (col. 4, lines 63-65 shows "the mirror 34 being placed in a given position relative to the razor, it will tend to stay in that relative position until later intentionally. repositioned", therefore, it meets the claimed limitations); the mirror having a first position in which the mirror extends laterally relative to a first side of the hair trimming device and a second position in which the mirror extends laterally relative to a second side of the hair trimming device, the second side being opposite to the first side (magnifying lens 34 having shaft balls 26, 38 positioned within sockets 30, 32 therefore providing an adjustability to the position of the device such as the handles 26, 36 can move laterally relative to a first side of the trimming device to a second side of the trimming device). It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the attachment structure as taught by Ringdahl into the device of Tiram for the purpose of providing position which is adjustable relative to the razor blade. In regard to claim 13, Tiram in view of Ringdahl shows the trimming device having a hair trimming element facing a first direction and the mirror facing generally in the first direction. In regard to claim 9, Tiram in view of Ringdahl shows a structure (Ringdahl 30, 26) that releasably retains the mirror in the first and second positions. In regard to claim 10, Tiram in view of Ringdahl show the hair trimming device having a hair trimming element (24, Tiram) facing in a first direction and the mirror facing generally in the first direction (Tiram, fig. 10). In regard to claim 14, Tiram in view of Ringdahl show an attachment structure (22) adapted to attached the

Art Unit: 3732

magnifying lens to an elongate element (10), the attachment structure having first and second opposite sides and a member (30, 26) coupling the lens (34) to the attachment structure, the member having a first position in which the mirror inherently being held resiliently and extends beyond the first side of the attachment of the attachment structure and a second position in which the lens inherently being held resiliently and extends beyond the second side of the attachment structure (same analysis as discussed above in claim 8), the member having a structure (ball and socket) releasably retaining the connector in its first and second positions. In regard to claims 11 and 16, 17, Tiram in view of Ringdahl show the mirror being a magnifying mirror (Tiram, col. 4, line 58). With regard to claims 1 and 2, 15, Tiram in view of Ringdahl discloses the above device which inherently shows a step of placing the hair trimming device (24) having at least a magnifying mirror attached thereto, wherein the mirror inherently being held resiliently in one of two fixed positions lateral to the body (Ringdahl, col. 4, lines 63-65) and manipulating the hair trimming device to remove hair from portions of the body of the user, Tiram fails to show the step of facing a first mirror as a reflection of the mirror attached to the hair trimming device, however, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art to use such device in combination with another mirror in order to provide a view from the mirror of the hair trimming device. In regard to claim 3 and 4, 5, Tiram in view of Ringdahl inherently shows the mirror of the hair trimming device being arranged to move and extend beyond the hair trimming device (Ringdahl, fig. 2) laterally with respect to each side of the body of the user and the the mirror inherently being held resiliently in one of two fixed positions lateral to the body

Art Unit: 3732

(Ringdahl, col. 4, lines 63-65). In regard to claim 7, Tiram in view of Ringdahl inherently shows the claimed method step.

Response to Arguments

Applicant has admitted that Ringdahl shows the mirror being held in a position lateral to the body, however, Applicant has argued that the mirror shown by Ringdahl is not held resiliently because of the ball-joint structures. As discussed above, Ringdahl shows the mirror tends to stay in a relative position until later intentionally repositioned, therefore, one skill in the art would knows that the mirror is resiliently fixed in a certain position.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3732

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robyn Doan whose telephone number is (571) 272-4711. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cris Rodriguez can be reached on (571) 272-4964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robyn Doan/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 3732

rkd August 5, 2007